

REMARKS

The claims have been renumbered and amended to better define the invention. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is now respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

French reference FR731324 relates to a reflector having an annular prism 2 that is positioned at the height of the lamp filament 3 for total internal reflection of the light from the filament. The light from the filament is not “trapped” as defined in the amended claims, and this reference teaches nothing with regard to such trapped light. Accordingly, applicant submits that FR731324 has nothing that would anticipate the invention as claimed or render it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The office action applied the Sitzema reference in the rejection of claims under 35 USC §§102, 103, and it is submitted that this reference neither anticipates nor renders obvious the invention as now claimed. Claim 23 recites a reflector having opposed inner and outer surfaces, reflecting elements on an outer surface for reflecting light back through the inner surface and toward an exit aperture, and a flange that receives light trapped between the inner and outer walls and modifies it. Sitzema has no disclosure of this structure.

Sitzema is directed to a two-part optical assembly comprising a prismatic reflector/refractor 100 and a shroud 200. The thrust of the Sitzema disclosure is the combination of prismatic reflector/refractor 100 that is specifically designed to provide a certain amount of additional light through its sidewall for adding illumination to the surround (col. 4, lines 5-8) with the shroud 200 that improves glare control through a combination of one or more features of diffusion, optical refraction, and optional pigmentation (col. 4, lines 28-32). Sitzema teaches nothing with regard to light that is trapped between inner and outer walls of the prismatic reflector/refractor 100 and in particular teaches nothing about the

passage of such trapped light into or through the lower flange 108, or its modification. Neither does Sitzema contain any teaching with regard to light trapped between inner and outer walls of the shroud 200 or the passage of such light through a lower flange 208.

The office action references the Sitzema patent at col. 5, lines 56 *et seq.*, but that portion of the patent refers specifically to the shroud, and as noted there is no reference whatsoever to trapped light in the wall of the shroud or its incidence on the flange 208.

Sitzema is directed primarily at glare control, which is completely different from the issue addressed by the claimed invention. The claimed invention is concerned with light trapped between the walls that eventually emanates from the flange, and Sitzema has nothing to do with this light. Thus, Sitezma contains nothing that discloses or renders obvious the invention as now claimed.

With respect to claims 17 and 18, applicant submits that these angles have been shown to provide particularly good results. No reference of record contains any suggestion of such angles and nothing in the art of record provides the person of skill in the art with any basis on which to “discover” this preferred structure. The office action takes the position that it would have been obvious because it has been held that “where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, citing *In re Aller*. Applicant submits that this rejection fails at the outset, because it has not been shown that any reference of record teaches “the general conditions” in the first place.

The office action also cites the ‘318 patent to Csanyi. This reference teaches nothing relevant to the claimed invention because it discloses only a reflecting lamp comprising a light source and a mirror with a reflecting surface on the surface adjacent the light source. The Csanyi projector lamp does not have inner and outer surface that trap light between them as in the claimed invention. Thus, Csayni teaches nothing more than a mirror and adds nothing

to Sitzema that would give the person of skill in the art a reason to modify Sitzema to obtain the claimed invention.

Applicant also notes that the PTO-892 does not cite the Csanyi patent, and applicant respectfully asks that this be done.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any outstanding matters.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY

/Conrad J. Clark/

Conrad J. Clark
Registration No. 30,340

Customer No. 22902
1700 Diagonal Road
Suite 510
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: 202-835-1111

Docket No.: 11059-0008US
Date: July 21, 2010